

**REMARKS**

The undersigned counsel thanks Examiner Prone for his courtesy during telephone conferences with the undersigned on March 11, 2003.

During the telephone conferences, counsel explained that in the Response filed February 6, 2003, applicant had withdrawn the proposed amendment to claims 6 and 14, which had never been entered. Basically, the Response filed February 6, 2003 tracked the Amendment filed January 13, 2003 with the exception that the amendments to claims 6 and 14 were withdrawn.

The Examiner indicated during the telephone conferences with the undersigned counsel that he missed the withdrawal of the proposed amendments and therefore issued the Advisory Action of March 3, 2003 indicating the proposed amendments would not be entered. The Examiner requested that we submit this Reply setting forth that the amendments to claims 6 and 14 were never entered. The Examiner graciously agreed to consider the Response filed January 13, 2003 minus the amendments to the claims.

Claims 6-17 remain pending in the application. As the proposed amendments to claims 6 and 14 were never entered, applicant cannot amend the claims to delete the proposed amendments to claims 6 and 14. To clarify the record, applicant submits herewith a clean set of the pending claims 6-17, which should replace all prior versions of the claims in the application.

The Examiner is requested to consider the arguments presented in the Responses filed February 6 and January 13, 2003 distinguishing the cited references. As set forth in the previous responses, the cited references can be distinguished on the basis of structural and functional differences and on the basis that Burnham is non-analogous art, without reliance on claim amendments.

None of the references taken either singularly or in combination show or suggest a device for cutting brittle materials which has opposed arcuately shaped blade edges that have opposing movement between an opened and closed position in which the distance between the opposed sections of the blade edges varies along the blade edges when the blade edges are in a closed position.

In view of the above and the Remarks in the previous Responses to the Final Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance. Favorable action on the merits, including allowance of all pending claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/11/03

  
Dinah H. Lewitan  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 31,977  
WEINGRAM & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
P.O. Box 927  
Maywood, NJ 07607  
Tel: (201) 843-6300  
Fax: (201) 843-6495

CLEAN SET OF PENDING CLAIMS

6. A corner cutter comprising:

a cutter body including upper and lower handles having a pivot securing said handles together, said lower handle having an upper blade end extending beyond said pivot and having an arcuate first blade edge secured thereto,

said upper handle having a lower blade end extending beyond said pivot and opposing said upper blade end, said lower blade end having an arcuate second blade edge secured thereto,

said handles and blade ends being pivotable about said pivot to provide opposing movement of said first and second blade edges between an open and closed position,

said first and second blade edges being disposed in mutually opposing positions and the space between said first and second blade edges varies along the length of the edges when said first and second cutting edges are in the closed position for cutting sheets of brittle material positioned between said blade edges.

7. The device of claim 6 wherein said first and said second blade edges each have outer portions and in inner portion and the distance between the opposing outer portions of said first and second blade edges is less than the distance between said inner portions of said first and second blade edges.

8. The device of claim 6 wherein the outer portions of said opposing blade ends are curved for cutting curves into said sheets of brittle material between said edges.

9. The device of claim 6 including a return spring connected between said upper and lower handles.

10. The device of claim 9 including stop means connected between opposite ends of said upper and lower handles for maintaining said handles in a normally open position.

11. The device of claim 6 wherein the opposing blade edges are disposed to be perpendicular to the surfaces of sheets of brittle material there between.

12. The device of claim 11 wherein one of the opposing blade edges has an angled inner surface providing a sharp edge for cutting said brittle material.

13. The device of claim 11 including a guide secured to said lower blade end for positioning said lower blade end on a sheet of brittle material for simplifying the cutting of said sheet.

14. The device of claim 6 wherein said first and said second blade edges each have two opposing outer portions and an opposing inner portion and the space between one of the two opposing outer portions of said first and said second blade edges is less than the space between the other of said opposing outer portions of said first and said second blade edges.

15. The device of claim 6 wherein said first and said second blade edges each contain a portion parallel to the axis of said pivot.

16. The device of claim 6 wherein said arcuate curved first and second blade edges are concave with respect to the axis of said pivot to cut an outer curve.

17. The device of claim 6 wherein said arcuate curved first and second blade edges are convex with respect to the axis of said pivot to cut an inner curve.